DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 403 459 CE 073 387

AUTHOR Wichowski, Chester P.; Walker, Thomas J.
TITLE Using Qualitative Research To Define Statewide Professional Personnel Development.
INSTITUTION Temple Univ., Philadelphia, PA. Center for Vocational Education Professional Personnel Development.
PUB DATE Dec 96
NOTE 36p.; Paper presented at the American Vocational Association Convention (Cincinnati, OH, December 5-8, 1996).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Evaluation Methods; Inservice Teacher Education; Interviews; Needs Assessment; Postsecondary Education; Preservice Teacher Education; *Professional Development; Program Evaluation; *Qualitative Research; Research Methodology; Secondary Education; State Programs; Statewide Planning; *Vocational Education Teachers
IDENTIFIERS *Pennsylvania

ABSTRACT

The Temple University Center for Vocational Education Professional Personnel Development (PPD), one of three regional centers in Pennsylvania, used qualitative strategies for steering PPD programs. Center personnel found that collecting quantitative data was absolutely necessary to determine whether objectives were being met, but was not always sufficient for making informed judgments. The decision-making process benefitted from the integration of qualitative strategies into the formative and summative evaluations of PPD programs and activities. Three strategies were especially helpful in collecting information and applying it in a formative manner to illuminate work/initiatives in progress. The first strategy was a semi-structured interview technique selected to collect information on the effect a redesigned performance evaluation requirement, used for awarding provisional certification to vocational teachers, was having on intern teachers. The second strategy, a behavioral event interview method, was used to collect information on how a shift in the locus of management (from Temple University to local school district) of a teacher leadership program was affecting teachers and students in the eastern region. The third strategy used a combination of quantitative and qualitative procedures to report findings for the annual evaluation/needs assessment of the center's Professional Development Advisory Committee. (Appendixes contain 18 references and instruments.) (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

The Center for Vocational Education
Professional Personnel Development

ED 403 459

Using Qualitative Research to Define Statewide Professional Personnel Development

by

Chester P. Wichowski
Senior Research Associate

Thomas J. Walker
Center Director

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

CW Chowski

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CE073387

TEMPLE UNIVERSITY

Using Qualitative Research to Define Statewide Professional Personnel Development

Chester P. Wichowski and Thomas J. Walker

Temple University

Paper Presented at the

New and Related Services, Personnel Development Division,

American Vocational Association Conference, Cincinnati, OH

December 1996

Using Qualitative Research to Define Statewide Professional Personnel Development

by

Chester P. Wichowski and Thomas J. Walker

Temple University

Introduction

The successful operation of regional programs in a statewide system of vocational education professional personnel development cannot be left to chance. Aligning interventions for preservice and inservice teachers, administrators, and education specialists with local, regional, and state priorities requires a careful examination of situational needs and the collection of the best information available. This paper will highlight qualitative strategies being used for steering professional personnel development programs at the Temple University Center for Vocational Education Professional Personnel Development, one of three regional professional personnel development Centers in the Commonwealth. Specifically, three strategies will be discussed: (a) the semi-structured interview, (b) the behavioral event interview, and (c) combining qualitative and quantitative procedures. To provide a context for the discussion, we will begin the paper with an overview of PA's statewide professional personnel development system, and follow with background information on quantitative and qualitative methods, and research evaluation. The specific programs/activities and use of the strategies will then be examined.

PA's Vocational Education Professional Personnel Development System

Research on teacher effectiveness clearly shows that teachers do make a difference (Cruickshank, 1990). Teachers substantially influence student behavior, work skills, and occupational achievement. Without professional personnel of high quality, one cannot expect to graduate occupationally competent students. Policy officials in the Pennsylvania Department of Education (PDE) have embraced this notion by recognizing professional development to be among the most essential aspects of vocational education in the Commonwealth. Thus, to assure an adequate supply of competent vocational teachers, supervisors, administrators, and support personnel for PA's schools, the PDE (Bureau of Vocational-Technical Education) has funded regional Professional Personnel Development Centers at selected university sites across the Commonwealth. The Centers, at Indiana University of PA, the Pennsylvania State University, and Temple University, have operated for nearly 20 years serving, respectively, the western, central, and eastern regions of the state.

PDE appropriates basic funds to each university to finance the Centers. The funding strategy was designed...

> ...to ensure that elements required to give continuity, stability and responsiveness to shifting needs for vocational education professional personnel be available in Centers of sufficient size to have a "critical mass" of resources that can be able to be applied flexibly and responsively to the priority staff development needs. (Herr & Adamsky, 1985, p. 1)

But in addition to a funding strategy for achieving program continuity and coherence, regionally located Centers were also designed to...

> ...maximize accountability for their resource allocations, thereby leading to continuous communication between the Pennsylvania Department of Education (PDE) and the Center management as well as rapid responses to state priorities for both supply and quality of vocational education personnel. (Herr & Adamsky, 1985, p. 1)

Centers are responsible for the delivery of services around a block of broad-based, common objectives. Currently, the following activities are supported:

1. A comprehensive Occupational Competency Assessment (OCA) program.
2. Outreach services (Vocational Intern/Instructional Certification Program) for personnel off-campus through traditional undergraduate courses and/or field-based competency-based teacher education (FB-CBTE).
3. Outreach services (Vocational Education Curriculum Specialist; Supervisor and Director Certification Program; Teacher Leadership Program) for personnel off-campus through traditional graduate courses and/or field-based competency-based leadership training (FB-CBLT).
4. Continued technical and professional updating, including workshops and seminars, for personnel from vocational-technical content areas.
5. Pre-induction, professional education for clients recruited from business, industry, and health occupations with little or no pedagogical education or experience.
6. An occupational experience program.
7. Placement services for vocational-technical professional personnel.

8. A recruitment system for vocational-technical teachers and leadership personnel.
9. Assistance for schools in developing and revising curricula, and in using curriculum packages like the V-TECS Direct Software Package.
10. Assistance for vocational-technical educators serving disadvantaged learners.
11. Assistance for vocational-technical educators serving disabled learners.
12. Support for research in vocational-technical education.
13. Center management for vocational-technical professional personnel development.

All three Centers provide services to meet the objectives/activities, and do so in ways to fulfill the professional personnel development needs of the clients in the respective regions being served. Variations exist in the programs designed and delivered by each Center. This is necessary to respond to demographic patterns unique to each Center's service area, as well as to adhere to differences among university regulations affecting the delivery of programs as well as regulations governing the manner in which funds can be disbursed. Thus, the professional personnel development program designed to meet the needs of clients for any one objective often varies from Center to Center. Further, new programs are constantly emerging to respond to the changing regional professional development needs of the educators being served. It is important to note, however, that each university is held

accountable for funds and meeting objectives through a State Accountability System (Cotrell, 1987).

The need for timely and accurate information is critical to the successful operation of all aspects of a Center. At the Temple Center, for example, we conduct systematic needs assessments, annual program evaluations, as well as event related summative evaluations using quantitative survey instrumentation to determine the degree to which objectives are being met. These quantitative methods have proven themselves effective measures for determining program compliance and in identifying ripples in data fluctuation, which through further inquiry contribute to situational understanding and subsequent adjustments in program delivery. In other instances, however, there has been a need to go beyond the Lickert scaled evaluation instrument that we in education are so familiar with and collect data on programs that are emerging, as well as in categories that may be better served through other forms of evaluation. Stated differently, we at the Temple University Center have found collecting quantitative data to be absolutely necessary, but not always sufficient for making informed judgements.

Quantitative and Qualitative Methods

Tradition seems to support a tendency for educators to rely solely on the use of quantitative methods for the collection of information in the form of numerical data for gauging program compliance. This tendency dates back to the beginning of the century when the debate between the merits of quantitative versus qualitative research methods seems to have originated. John Stuart Mill (1843/1906) has been credited as

the first to urge those in the social sciences to emulate their more senior compatriots in the hard sciences of mathematics, physics, and chemistry where quantification rules. Further, Mills advised social scientists of that era, who were in effect the new "kids on the block," that the adoption of quantitative methods would lead to rapid maturation of their emerging fields (Guba & Lincoln, 1994).

Jacob (1988) points out the foundation that perhaps began with Mill early in the century has continued to serve as an influence on all aspects of educational research up to, at least, the early nineteen-eighties. This era marked the beginning of challenges to educational researchers to go beyond the sole use of positivism vis-a-vis quantitative research, and the scientific method (Campbell, 1978; Cornbach, 1975). Jacob (1988) further postulates that one factor that may have contributed to resistance toward the application of qualitative methods in educational research is a lack of understanding of what qualitative research is. Further, as one reviews the literature, it becomes clear that qualitative research means different things to different people (Borg & Gall, 1989; Bogdan & Biklen, 1982; Janesick, 1974; Kerlinger, 1986; Patton, 1980).

Contributing to the lack of understanding may be the confusion caused by the series of themes associated with qualitative research during the 1970s and 1980s. These include

1. An emphasis on the importance of conducting research in a natural setting;
2. A stress on the importance of understanding the participants'

perspective;

3. Research that is founded on participant observation; and

4. Research that is free of predetermined theories and questions, that is, with questions and theories emerging after data collection rather than being proposed before the initiation of any research.

The reality is that each of these themes is true. Further, qualitative research represents a number of distinct research methods used in several social science disciplines. And, as particular methods have been applied and reported on in educational settings, each method may have taken on the quality of a "mistaken identity" and perhaps, erroneously, come to be viewed as a model for all qualitative research. Janesick (1994) lists fifteen basic research strategies that constitute methods in the realm of qualitative research. These include, but are not limited to

Ethnography	Life history
Oral histories	Ethnomethology
Case studies	Participant observation
Field research	Phenomenoligical study
Ecological descriptive study	Symbolic interactionist study
Microethnography	Interpretive research
Action research	Historiography
Literary criticism	

Another factor contributing to the reluctance by educators to use qualitative research methods in educational settings is that some view the choice between

qualitative or quantitative as a "forced choice" of one method over the other. This certainly should not be the case. Each approach is sound and includes many techniques with unique properties appropriate to the satisfaction of specialized research needs. Often a combination of techniques from these two methods can be used in a complimentary manner. If research is done using a combination of techniques, outcomes can be supportive in a convergent fashion.

Evaluation Research

Borg and Gall (1989) ask the question, is evaluation research the same as educational research? They then provide the answer: the generally accepted view is that there is a great degree of overlap. In practice, research evaluators make use of qualitative and quantitative research methods, measurement tools, and appropriate statistical analysis procedures as needed. Although three general differences have been identified between educational research and evaluation research, the primary difference may lie in the area of intent.

Most educational research is usually initiated by the development of a hypothesis about the relationship of two or more variables to each other. Once determined, newly gained knowledge is used to accept or reject the stated hypothesis. Any further application of the knowledge gained as a result of the research is often not pursued.

Evaluation research is usually initiated for the specific purpose of decision making. The application of formative evaluation procedures is necessary to collect the best information possible to aid in determining further direction in a project or a

program. Weiss (1972) characterizes application as a central quality of evaluation research.

A second difference often noted between educational research and evaluation research is in the degree to which findings are generalizable. Educational research often employs the use of a sample randomly drawn to represent a population. Conclusions are reached after the use of some treatment in an experimental or quasi-experimental design and the use of inferential statistics relating to behavior that is either predictable or generalizable to the population as a whole.

In contrast, evaluation research is typically done for a specific limited purpose and does not employ a sample drawn from a population. Statistical procedures used in evaluation research are often descriptive and/or in the realm of nonparametrics, that is, statistics that are distribution free and requiring no assumptions about the form or structure of a sampled population (Downey & Heath, 1990).

The third common difference between educational and evaluation research lies in the area of value. According to Borg and Gall (1989), the primary function of evaluation research is to yield data on the relative value or worth of a phenomenon or program. The primary function of educational research, on the other hand, is more often directed toward the generation of knowledge. A secondary function of educational research may be the relative value of some treatment. Further application is, at best, often limited to a recommendation rather than a point of value or any actual application. In contrast, the primary utility of evaluation is in its point of value application to decision making.

Three Examples/Applications

The Temple University Center is benefiting from qualitative strategies being integrated into the formative and summative evaluations of our professional personnel development programs and activities. Three strategies have been especially helpful in collecting information and applying it in a formative manner to illuminate work/initiatives in progress. In the first example, a semi-structured interview technique was used to collect information on the effect a redesigned performance evaluation requirement, used for awarding provisional certification to vocational teachers, was having on intern teachers. The second example, a behavioral event interview method was used to collect information on how a shift in the locus of management (from Temple University to local school district) of a teacher leadership program was impacting teachers and students in the eastern region of Pennsylvania. The third example used a combination of quantitative and qualitative procedures to report findings for the annual evaluation/needs assessment of the Temple Center's Professional Development Advisory Committee. Each strategy will be discussed using a format that includes (a) an introduction to describe the setting and the need for the investigation, (b) an example of the instrumentation and methods used, and (c) a description of the findings and comments.

Semi-Structured Interview

A semi-structured interview technique was selected to collect information on the effect changes to the culminating performance evaluation requirement in Temple's provisional vocational teacher certification program were having on intern teachers. A

performance evaluation, known as the Council of Educators (COE) review, is used as an exit criterion in our provisional teacher certification program, and for endorsing new teachers for teaching certification. The Council consists of a local district master teacher, a local school administrator, and a Temple University faculty member. Over the years, the COE review process, which requires intern teachers to demonstrate selected teaching competencies in a videotaped lesson after having satisfied university course requirements, had grown to be routine. The metamorphosis had occurred slowly and inadvertently as the result of program faculty wanting to help interns to produce the "perfect" videotape (final performance). But faculty had become so directional at this phase of the program that they were actually "thinking for" the interns and, thereby, reducing the interns' capacity for creativity and decision making. As a result, the program was operating counter to the principles of the teacher education model the Center was advancing. The COE performance review had become an event for which an intern showed up, videotape and lesson plan in hand (often the result of several takes), but with only a passive role to play in answering questions about the performance.

Our desire was to make the COE review a spontaneous and creative learning experience with intern teachers at the center of the process, describing and discussing their teaching, planning, and decision making. The COE we envisioned was one where interns would demonstrate, in an unrehearsed video presentation, their achievement of various program goals, namely, self-direction, intentionality, pedagogy, and reflective teaching ability.

We implemented a redesigned COE process in the Fall semester of 1995. The new framework literally changed the direction of the evaluation arrows. That is, instead of placing the practitioners in the role of expert reviewers with the intern being inspected, intern teachers were expected to become the experts (at the proficient beginner level) and demonstrate their professional accomplishments by explaining and analyzing their lessons for the reviewers. The new framework introduced a philosophical shift and new procedures for interns to follow so we were interested in knowing the effects on interns from the very start.

As was stated above, the semi-structured interview was used for monitoring the changes to the COE review. It differed from a structured interview in regard to the use of open-ended questions. The structured interview (a) employs a series of preestablished questions with a limited set of possible response categories, (b) provides little room for variation in regard to the questions or the sequence in which they are asked, and (c) the interviewer controls the pace of the interview by treating the questionnaire as if it were a theatrical script. All respondents receive the same introduction and questions (Fontana & Frey, 1995). Unlike the classic structured interview, which typically uses little or no open-ended questions, all questions in the COE exit interview were designed in an open-ended format (see COE Exit Interview, Appendix A). This format was chosen to aid in exploring the intern teachers' reactions.

The findings from 15 phone and on-site interviews indicated a high level of support for the new COE format, as well as for the philosophical shift enacted at the

Center. Additional information gained from the interviews included insight into (a) steps the intern teachers took to effectively prepare for their COE, (b) factors that contributed to the success of intern teachers during their COE, and (c) information that could be used by our professional staff to work more effectively with intern teachers in the future. Some samples of answers provided by respondents on the effectiveness of the new COE format included

> The old COE format, from what I've heard, was a headache...this wasn't.
>
> The old COEs were a show...the new ones are real.
>
> The majority of the effort in the past was in making the video tape beautiful...that was terrible.
>
> It gave me a chance to prove myself as a professional to others. I'm a T&I guy from industry and the only nondegree teacher in the building. Getting through the COE gave me a sense of professional worth. I now have a strong feeling of confidence...I can teach with the best of them.

Behavioral Event Interview

The behavioral event interview method was selected to review the Center's Lead Teacher Program. Our Lead Teacher consortium was formalized in 1988. The consortium was conceptualized as a tripartite arrangement between teachers, school administrators, and university faculty. It was conceived as a regional network for professional development that was (a) teacher centered, (b) committed to and invested in by school administrators, and (c) nurtured, rather than steered by the university. The hope of the Consortium is to improve teaching and learning in eastern region schools by using master teachers in leadership roles. The idea undergirding the program is to tap the expertise and creativity of staff who are highly regarded by

their colleagues and assist them in working collaboratively with their peers so that collective knowledge and experience can be brought to bear on decisions affecting teaching and learning. We believe that given the authority, resources, and training, master teachers can be an important resource for shaping teaching practice and tackling school improvement issues (Walker, 1993).

We wanted to explore (a) the effect the lead teacher program was having on the master teachers and their students, and (b) the effect an organizational change in the program may have had on participants. The organizational change involved switching the locus of management for the program from the university to the school district level, and also included creating sub-regional networks of lead teachers in eastern Pennsylvania. The changes were seen as ways to increase ownership by the practicing profession for the lead teacher initiative.

The behavioral event interview method, credited to McClelland and McBer and Co. (1978), is often used to identify incumbent worker competencies and diagnose organizational issues (Cobb, 1996). Although semi-structured, this interviewing technique does not necessarily use any questions that directly address the areas to be explored per se. Instead, a series of questions is developed that progresses in two stages. The first stage establishes a demographic foundation, the second provides an opportunity for the respondent to nominate an event or two they consider to be significant. Behavioral event interviewing has also been compared to the critical incident review technique method sometimes used in curriculum development.

The events nominated during the interview are further explored through yet

another set of prepared questions designed to probe the event. During this phase of the interview, questions that frame the story are helpful. Some examples of these include

What led up to the event?

What did someone say or do?

What was the mood?

What were you feeling, what were your expectations at the time?

What was the impact or significance of the event?

It should be noted that emphasis is placed on using questions that explore the behaviors or affect associated with the event. It is from this reference that the term "behavioral event interview" is derived, (see the Behavioral Event Interview in the Appendix B).

There is no attempt to direct the person being interviewed to nominate any specific event over another. There are only two criteria: (a) that the event is significant to the individual, and (b) that it be either an event considered to be successful or, as in the case of the second event the individual was requested to nominate in our evaluation, an event that may <u>not</u> have turned out as anticipated.

Since several individuals are interviewed using the same structured questions, the collective responses provide a range of information on several different nominated events. The pool of information collected serves as a rich source of (a) testimony supporting the effectiveness of an event, (b) awareness of different actions that may have been attempted but might not have otherwise been known, (c) insight on factors

that contributed to the success or failure of an event, and (d) insight to the circumstances associated with an event that might not otherwise be captured. Furthermore, information collected may also provide confirmatory support through convergent evidence regarding events studied.

The results of the six behavioral event interviews conducted with the Lead Teachers provided the information we sought. The LT program had a range of impact on its participants and on the educational process. One excerpt from an interview transcript provides a poignant illustration:

> I had 15 years experience as a science teacher in a comprehensive high school and thought I knew it all. Well that all changed when I became a science teacher in an AVTS. No longer did I have a classroom full of high achievers. My teaching and motivating techniques from the past no longer were useful.
>
> The reflective practices I learned through the lead teacher program gave me the skills I needed to develop my teaching skills in order to be successful in this new setting. I took a risk that I never imagined myself doing...I asked my students to reflect with me on what needed to be done to make the science program work for them and me.
>
> What evolved is what I call the renaissance project. A complete restructuring of the science program in regard to the way the material was introduced, organized, and presented. High standards weren't resisted, they were, in fact, held in regard...they were no longer my standards, they were our standards. The renaissance was so complete, we even painted the classroom a new color.

Two additional excerpts from other interviews provided focus on the newly established lead teacher regional network:

> The development of the mini-versity for sharing information among lead teachers has proven to be a great success. If this concept hadn't been shared outside the region it was developed in, we would not have ever heard of it. Through the mini-versity, I have become better informed and, quite frankly, have more confidence in myself than I had before

> participating in this program. Other teachers that didn't even know my name before, look to me for information and seek out my advice. I think that the information from the mini-versity has extended beyond the lead teacher network and has become an expectation among the teachers and administrators at my school.
>
> I've been teaching for seven years and the information I have gained about reflective teaching, strategic planning, the integration of academic and vocational education and other innovations in education have made me the resident expert in my school. I report on new information and techniques at our scheduled faculty meetings. My director has asked me to serve on the schools strategic planning committee. I don't think that I would have developed this much confidence in myself or be anywhere as near informed as I now am if I were not involved in the lead teacher program.

Combining Qualitative and Quantitative Strategies

The Professional Development Advisory Committee, PDAC, operates to provide advice on the operation and development of policy for the Temple Center. As a matter of procedure, the PDAC has been routinely evaluated on an annual basis. Upon recent review, it was determined that the instrument that had been used in the past no longer met the evaluation needs of the present. Current needs required an annual evaluation that addressed the Center's 13 operating objectives, as well as an assessment of needs. The evaluation instrument used in the past was limited to the internal operations of the PDAC.

After several strategy sessions, it was decided to design an instrument that could be used in concert with a focus group format to collect and report on evaluation and needs assessment information (see PDAC Evaluation/Needs Assessment with Instructions in Appendix C). The instrument lists the Center's 13 objectives under three organizational headings: outreach, professional/technical support, and support

services. A Lickert type scale is provided for each item. Although the instrument can be administered in a paper and pencil format, we felt the information collected would be more complete if it was also reviewed and discussed in a focus group setting as part of the administration. We felt the focus group process would provide an opportunity to answer questions that might arise when data from a small population is collected through the independent use of the instrument.

Consider, for example, the following representation of data collected from a pilot application of the instrument without the benefit of a focus group follow up.

PDAC Evaluation/Needs Assessment: Spring 1996

Number	1a	1b	1c	2a	2b	2c	2d	2e	3a	3b	3c	3d	3e
1	4	3	3	4	3	3	4				3	3	3
2	4	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	3	3	4	2	2
3	4		4	2	3	2	4	1					
4	4	3	4	4	4	4	3		2	2	4	3	3
5	4	2	2	3	4	4	3		2	2	4	3	3
6	4	3	4	3	4	3	4	3	4	4	4	3	3
7				4	2	4	3	2				4	4
8	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	1	1	1	3	2	2
9	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
10	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
11	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
AVG=	3.89	3.13	3.44	3.30	3.40	3.40	3.60	2.88	3.14	3.14	3.75	3.11	3.11

*The instrument from respondent no. 10 had all items marked uncertain along with a note indicating that his schedule did not allow him to attend enough meetings to feel knowledgeable to respond any other way.

Through review, 12 of the 13 calculated means were in the range of acceptability (3.11 - 3.89) on the four point scaling of the instrumentation used in the evaluation/needs assessment. Item 2e with a mean of 2.88 is the exception. Or is it?

A partial answer to this question may be found upon closer examination of the raw data. First, the distribution of data in items 2e, 3a, 3b, 3c, 3d, and 3e is skewed to the right. In addition to a kurtosis to the right, there is also a degree of missing data in several items.

Second, it may be important to review some of the response patterns. Respondent number 10 returned the instrument with a note indicating that he was uncertain on all items since his schedule only allowed him to attend one meeting. What can we assume about the missing data from other respondents? What can/should we speculate about ratings of uncertain (which were treated the same as a non-response)? Further, what level of validity should be attached to ratings under these circumstances? Did other respondents who checked uncertain or who chose not to respond lack confidence to reply because they missed meetings? Did the respondents who provided a rating of 1 or 2 to item 2e do so for the same reason or did they feel this item was not covered well during the meetings they attended? If so, what confidence can we attach to the ratings of the three respondents who rated this same item with a 4? Do we know their meeting attendance record? What does this divergent response pattern represent? Lastly, what can be said of the two respondents who provided ratings of 4 to all items?

Clearly quantitative data, by itself, in this case, cannot provide the answers to

these questions. The only way to determine answers is to go beyond the data. It is necessary to go directly to the source, the respondents themselves. And this is exactly the approach that takes place through the focus group process we made integral to the PDAC evaluation/needs assessment. Not only does the combined method provide a mechanism to address answers that have been raised in regard to the data collected, it also provides a mechanism to discuss the content as well as the context of the evaluation. Further, it provides an opportunity to take the data to the next step - the identification of needs.

Summary

Three qualitative evaluation strategies being used at the Temple University Center for Vocational Education Professional Personnel Development were presented in this paper. The strategies were implemented to complement other data collection methods used at the Temple Center including systematic needs assessments, annual program evaluations, and event related summative evaluations using quantitative survey instrumentation. Blending qualitative and quantitative evaluation strategies has enhanced decision-making at our Center, which, in turn, is helping program managers to be responsive to local and regional professional development needs. The dual strategy is also helping Center management to keep its regional interventions for teachers, administrators, and education specialists aligned with statewide priority needs.

References

Bogdan, R. & Biklen, S. K. (1982). Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Borg, W. R. & Gall, M. D. (1989). Educational research. New York: Longman.

Cambell, D. T. (1978). Qualitative knowing in action research. In M. Brenner, P. Marsh, & M. Brenner (Eds.), The Social Context of Methods. (pp. 184-209), London: Croom Helm.

Cobb, J. (1996, September). A step-by-step process for conducting a behavioral event interview. Poster session presented at the Annual Conference on Using Competency-based Tools and Applications to Drive Organizational Performance, Chicago, IL.

Cornbach, L. J. (1975). Beyond the two disciplines of scientific psychology. American Psychologist, 30(2), 116-127.

Cotrell, C. J. (1987). Pennsylvania accountability system for professional personnel development centers. Pennsylvania Department of Education, Bureau of Vocational-Technical Education, Harrisburg, PA.

Cruickshank, D.R. (1990). Research that informs teachers and teacher educators. Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation: Bloomington, Indiana.

Downie & Heath (1990). Basic statistical methods. NY: Harper & Row.

Fontana, A. & Frey, J. H. (1994). Interviewing: The art of science. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), Handbook of Qualitative Research. (pp. 361 - 376),

London: Sage.

Guba, E. G. & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994) Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), Handbook of Qualitative Research. (pp. 105-117). London: Sage

Herr, E. & Adamsky, R. A. (1985). A position paper on the funding of vocational education professional personnel development programs in Pennsylvania. Pennsylvania Department of Education, Bureau of Vocational-Technical Education, Harrisburg, PA.

Jacob, E. (1988). Clarifying qualitative research: a focus on traditions. Educational Researcher, 17(1), 6-23.

Janesick, V. (1974). The dance of qualitative research design: metaphor, methodology, and meaning. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), Handbook of Qualitative Research. (pp. 209-219). London: Sage

Kerlinger, F. N. (1986). Foundations of behavioral research. Fort Worth, TX: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

McClelland, D. C. & McBer and Co. (1978). Guide to behavioral event interviewing. Boston: McBer and Co.

Patton, M. Q. (1980). Qualitative evaluation and research methods. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Walker, T. J. (1993). Critical pedagogy -- The practice with veteran teachers: The work of the eastern Pennsylvania lead teacher consortium. Journal of Industrial Teacher Education, 30(4), 29-41.

Weiss, C. H. (1972). Evaluation research: methods of assessing program effectiveness. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Appendix A

COE Exit Interview

As you realize the COE Review you recently completed represents a departure from the structure of COE Reviews in the past. Due to this change, we at the Temple Center would like to ask you some questions and explore your feelings regarding the new process.

Preparation: ...I would like to start by focusing on your preparation for the COE.

Describe the steps you took in preparing your COE portfolio.

What would you do differently if you were to prepare a COE portfolio again?

Describe how you approached your lesson planning and the level of support you received from your FRA as you finalized your lesson plan for the COE.

What changes would you recommend in the planning process?

What advice would you give to a VITAL Intern teacher who is near completion of their program and is about to begin the development of their COE lesson plan?

Oral Assessment: ...Let's move on to the oral assessment part of the COE.

How did you prepare for the oral assessment?

Describe your COE oral assessment and, if possible, comment on any aspects of the assessment that remain significant to you.

Is there anything you would do differently if you were able to do the oral assessment over?

What advice would you give to a VITAL Intern teacher who is about to go through their COE oral assessment?

Overall: ...In closing, let's look at the COE Review from an overall perspective.

On a scale ranging from a low of 1 to a high of 10, how would you rate your COE Review experience? What influenced your rating?

Is there anything else you would like to share regarding any aspect of your COE Review experience and, in particular, any actions that could be taken for the improvement of the COE experience for others?

Appendix B

LEAD TEACHER INTERVIEW

1. Date and Time:

2. Interviewee Code:

3. School Code:

(Start)

Mr., Mrs., Ms., Dr._____ as indicated earlier, the Center for Vocational Education Professional Personnel Development, Temple University is conducting a study on the characteristics of the lead teacher programs in vocational school settings in eastern Pennsylvania. This interview will focus on selected aspects of the lead teacher program in your school and on certain aspects of the lead teacher network in which you participate. This interview will contribute to the pool of information collected throughout eastern Pennsylvania in this study. Do you have any questions at this time?

Before we begin the interview, let me assure you that your comments will be kept confidential. We request that the interview be recorded so that an anonymous transcript can be made rather than risk any misinterpretation of information through recollection or note taking. Do you mind if we record the interview? (pause if no) If there is anything you don't want recorded, just indicate this to me during the interview and I'll turn off the recorder.

Do I have your permission to turn on the recorder and begin the interview now?

4. I would like to begin this interview by focusing on the background of your involvement as well as the initiation of the lead teacher program at your school.

   4.1 How long have you been a lead teacher?

   4.2 How did you become involved in the lead teacher program?

   4.3 What were your expectations of the lead teacher program when you first became involved?

      4.31 Have any of your expectations of the lead teacher program changed since your initial involvement?

4.32 (If they have) how have they changed and why?

4.4 Would you describe the professional development climate at your school arcund the time the lead teacher program was initiated?

4.41 Have there been any changes in the professional development climate at your school since the implementation of the lead teacher program?

4.42 (If yes) please describe the changes.

5. I would like to change our focus once again, and ask you to explain the operation of the lead teacher program at your school.

5.1 What are you doing now that you were not doing before becoming a lead teacher?

5.2 What kind of relationship do you see between the operation of the lead teacher program and the delivery of education at your school?

5.3 Has there been any physical changes at your school to support the operation of the lead teacher program?

5.31 (if yes) describe them; (if no) should there be and what kind?)

5.4 Has there been any school administration or School Board changes made to support the operation of the lead teacher program at your school? If so, describe them.

5.5 Has there been any changes in the operation of the lead teacher program at your school since it was initiated?
5.51 (If there has) what were they and why do you think they occurred?

6. At this time I would like to talk about the LTRC (Lead Teacher Regional Consortium) which you participate in with other lead teachers and faculty from Temple University.

6.1 What effect has the LTRC had on you as a lead teacher?

6.2 What effect has the LTRC had on the operation of the lead teacher program at your school?

6.3 What effect has your participation in the LTRC had on the improvement of instruction at your school for the novice teacher with less than 3 years of experience?

6.31 The more experienced teacher?

Event 1

Now I would like you to think about a specific activity or event in the lead teacher program that you consider successful or important. As you think of this event, please focus on your role as well as the role of others that contributed to its success.

Event: (Name the event or activity)

7.1 Describe the activity?

7.2 Who was involved and how?

7.3 How did the idea for this activity develop?

7.4 What kind of support or obstacles were encountered?

7.5 What do you think was the impact of this activity?

7.51 on you

7.52 on teachers

7.53 on administrators

7.54 on students

7.55 on other lead teachers

7.6 Was there any follow-up or other activities planned as a result of this event?

7.7 Is there anything that you think could have done to make this activity even more successful than it was?

Event 2

Excellent! Now I want you to think of another situation. This time I want you to focus on an event that did not go as planned. And with the ability to use hindsight, begin to focus on what could have been done to improve this activity.

Event: (Name the event or activity)

8.1 Describe the activity?

8.2 Who was involved and how?

8.3 How did the idea for this activity develop?

8.4 What kind of support or obstacles were encountered?

8.5 What was the impact of this activity?

8.51 on you

8.52 on teachers

8.53 on administrators

8.54 on students

8.55 on other lead teachers

8.61 Was there any follow-up or other activities planned as a result of this event?

8.7 What could have been done to make this activity more successful?

Thank you very much for your cooperation. The information you have provided will greatly assist us in our knowledge about the operation of the lead teacher program.

Appendix C

Temple University

The Center for Vocational Education
Professional Personnel Development

EVALUATION OF THE PDAC/SCANNING GROUPS ADVISORY PROCESS

Instructions

The attached instrument is designed for the evaluation of the PDAC/Scanning Groups advisory process during the past academic year.

The instrument addresses the Center objectives under three main categories: Outreach, Professional/Technical Support, and Support Services.

The PDAC members will divide into two groups. Each group will consider the degree to which the Center objectives have been covered in the advisory meetings of the past year and, under each of the three main categories, what recommendations might be made for improving the consideration of the objectives in the future, as well as other recommendations.

Each group will then report back to the plenary session on the consensus reached from its deliberations. A report will be drawn up and shared with those PDAC members not present at the meeting, for their input.

Temple University

The Center for Vocational Education
Professional Personnel Development

EVALUATION OF THE PDAC/SCANNING GROUPS ADVISORY PROCESS

Each group of persons filling out this instrument will consider the degree to which the objectives in each category have been covered in the PDAC advisory meetings of the past year and what recommendations might be made for improving the consideration of the objectives in the future, as well as other recommendations.

I. OUTREACH

A. FB/CBTE (VITAL/MASTERY) - Field-Based/Competency-Based Teacher Education: Provide outreach services (Vocational Intern/Instructional Certification Program) for personnel off-campus through traditional undergraduate courses and/or Field-Based Competency-Based Teacher Education, (FB-CBTE), programs.

Degree of Coverage:

None	Little	Some	Great	Uncertain
1	2	3	4	UN

B. FB/CBLE - Field-Based/Competency-Based Leadership Education: Provide outreach services (Vocational Education Curriculum Specialist, Supervisor, and Director Certification Program) for personnel off-campus through traditional graduate courses and/or Field-Based Competency-Based Leadership Training (FB-CBLT).

Degree of Coverage:

None	Little	Some	Great	Uncertain
1	2	3	4	UN

C. Outreach graduate courses: Provide outreach services (Vocational Education Curriculum Specialist, Supervisor, and Director Certification Program) for personnel off-campus through traditional graduate courses and/or Field-Based Competency-Based Leadership Training (FB-CBLT).

Degree of Coverage:

None	Little	Some	Great	Uncertain
1	2	3	4	UN

- Recommendations regarding Outreach:

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

II. Professional/Technical Support

A. Workshops and seminars: Provide inservice workshops and seminars for personnel from vocational-technical content areas.

Degree of coverage:

None	Little	Some	Great	Uncertain
1	2	3	4	UN

B. Pre-induction: Provide pre-induction, professional education for clients recruited from business, industry and the health occupations with little or no pedagogical education or experience.

Degree of coverage:

None	Little	Some	Great	Uncertain
1	2	3	4	UN

C. OCA: Develop and maintain a comprehensive Occupational Competency Assessment (OCA) program.

Degree of coverage:

None	Little	Some	Great	Uncertain
1	2	3	4	UN

D. V-TECS Direct: Assist vocational-technical education schools in using the V-TECS Direct Software Package to develop and revise curricula.

Degree of coverage:

None	Little	Some	Great	Uncertain
1	2	3	4	UN

E. Work experience: Provide an occupational work experience program.

Degree of coverage:

None	Little	Some	Great	Uncertain
1	2	3	4	UN

- Recommendations regarding Professional/Technical Support:

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

III. Support Services

A. Recruitment: Provide a recruitment system for vocational-technical teachers and leadership personnel.

Degree of coverage:

None	Little	Some	Great	Uncertain
1	2	3	4	UN

B. Placement: Provide placement services for vocational-technical professional personnel.

Degree of coverage:

None	Little	Some	Great	Uncertain
1	2	3	4	UN

C. Research: Provide support for research in vocational-technical education.

Degree of coverage:

None	Little	Some	Great	Uncertain
1	2	3	4	UN

D. Services to teachers of disadvantaged students: Provide assistance for vocational-technical educators serving disadvantaged learners.

Degree of coverage:

None	Little	Some	Great	Uncertain
1	2	3	4	UN

E. Services to teachers of disabled students: Provide assistance for vocational-technical educators serving disabled learners.

Degree of coverage:

None	Little	Some	Great	Uncertain
1	2	3	4	UN

- Recommendations regarding Support Services: